

**The Origin of Latin Haud and  
Greek ou; And the Extensions of  
the Originally Unextended**



## **Analecta Gorgiana**

**357**

**Series Editor**  
**George Anton Kiraz**

Analecta Gorgiana is a collection of long essays and short monographs which are consistently cited by modern scholars but previously difficult to find because of their original appearance in obscure publications. Carefully selected by a team of scholars based on their relevance to modern scholarship, these essays can now be fully utilized by scholars and proudly owned by libraries.

**The Origin of Latin Haud and  
Greek ou; And the Extensions of  
the Originally Unextended**

**Lionel Horton-Smith**



**gorgias press**

**2009**

Gorgias Press LLC, 180 Centennial Ave., Piscataway, NJ, 08854, USA

[www.gorgiaspress.com](http://www.gorgiaspress.com)

Copyright © 2009 by Gorgias Press LLC

Originally published in

All rights reserved under International and Pan-American Copyright Conventions. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording, scanning or otherwise without the prior written permission of Gorgias Press LLC.

2009



**ISBN 978-1-60724-611-4**

**ISSN 1935-6854**

Extract from *The American Journal of Philology* 18 (1897)

Printed in the United States of America

## II.

Idg. \**gho-* \**ghi-*:Lat. *ho-* in *hic* (from \**ho-i-ce*) from the Idg. demonstrative pronom. stem \**gho-* 'this.'<sup>1</sup>

Skr. <i>hi</i> (and <i>-hi</i> ) <sup>1</sup>	} Nom. acc. sing. neut. of the Idg. demonstr. pronom. stem * <i>ghi-</i> 'this' (whence in Skr. Avest. and Arm. the meaning 'for').
Avest. <i>zī</i> (and <i>zi</i> ) <sup>1</sup>	
Arm. <i>zi</i> <sup>2</sup>	
Gk. <i>-χί</i> in <i>ὀν-χί</i> <sup>3</sup>	

Gk. *-χ* in *ὀν-χ*, abridged from *-χί* in *ὀν-χί*.<sup>4</sup>

## III.

Idg. \**go-* \**qi-*:Gk. *τε* in *ὄν-τε* from the uninflected Idg. \**qe* 'how' (indefinite 'somehow' and 'as also' = 'and') of the Idg. interrogative and indefinite pronominal stem \**go-*, and identical with Skr. and Avest. *ca*, Lat. *-que*.<sup>5</sup>Gk. *τι* in *ὄν-τι*, nom. acc. sing. neut. of the Idg. interrog. and indef. pronom. stem \**qi-*, whence come also Skr. *nā-ki-ṣ* (for \**nā-ci-ṣ*) 'no one,' Lat. *quid*, etc.<sup>5</sup>Arm. *չ* in *օ-չ*: either (i) from Idg. \**qe* (: Gk. *τε* in *ὄν-τε*), meaning 'some-how,' so that *օ-չ* = 'no-how, in no wise.'<sup>5</sup>or (ii) from Idg. \**qi* (: Gk. *τι* in *ὄν-τι*) 'some-what,' so that *օ-չ* = 'not at all.'<sup>5</sup>

LIONEL HORTON-SMITH.

53 Queen's Gardens, Lancaster Gate, London, W.,  
and St. John's College, Cambridge; England.<sup>1</sup> Supra, §8 (a) (1), s. v. *ὀν-χί*, p. 62.<sup>2</sup> Supra, §9, pp. 65, 66.<sup>3</sup> Supra, §8 (a) (1), s. v. *ὀν-χί*, pp. 61, 62, and (b), p. 64.<sup>4</sup> Supra, §8 (a) (2) ad fin., p. 64.<sup>5</sup> Supra, §10 ad fin., p. 68.

#### IV.—THE ORIGIN OF LATIN *HAUD* AND GREEK οὐ; AND THE EXTENSIONS OF THE ORIGINALLY UNEXTENDED FORM.<sup>1</sup>

##### A.—THE ORIGIN OF LAT. *haud* GK. οὐ ‘NOT.’

###### §1. *Introduction.*

Lat. *haud* and Gk. οὐ ‘not’ have long been the subject of discussion, but it will hardly be contended that the question of their origin has yet received a satisfactory answer. Under these circumstances I would venture to offer a new explanation in the following pages.

§2. *The three forms hau, haud, haut. The evidence of (a) Inscriptions, (b) MSS and Libri, (c) The Ancient Grammarians. The form \*au established as the earlier Latin form.*

One of the chief difficulties lies in the Latin form. Hence we shall do well to examine this word first, to see what its earlier form was in Latin.

###### *The three forms hau, haud, haut.*

We have apparently three forms to deal with—namely, *hau*, *haud*, *haut*. Ritschl, Prol. ad Plaut. Trin., pp. xcix–cii (1848), writes: “Corruptelis autem etiam *haut* scriptura non raro proditur, velut cum pro eo *aut* positum est, e. g. Trinummus, vv. 362, 721. Sed novum est quod duabus *haut* et *haud* formis tertia *hau* accessit, suscepta a me ex Ambrosiano vv. 233 (*hau liquet*), 462 (*hau bonumst*), in eodemque codice aliis in fabulis tam saepe exstans, ut de calami lapsu cogitari nequeat.”

###### (a) *Inscriptional Evidence.*

The usual form of the word on inscriptions is *haud*, e. g. C. I. L. I 1306 *quoniam haud licitum*, but we find *hau* in one inscription,

<sup>1</sup> The present is the paper to which an advance-reference has already been made in the Essay on the ‘Establishment and Extension of the Law of Thurneysen and Havet,’ Part II (Amer. Journ. of Philology, vol. XVII, part 2, July, 1896), §6, p. 180, n. 3, and §8, p. 189, n. 1, and p. 193.

C. I. L. I 1007 (= Orelli 4848 = Gruterus, p. 769) *heic est sepulcrum hau pulcrum pulcrai feminae*.<sup>1</sup> *hau* does not occur again in C. I. L. I, nor does it occur at all in the indices to C. I. L. II–V (incl.), VII–X (incl.), XII, XIV. The form *haut* is found in C. I. L. II 562 '*haut licitum*' (an inscription 'aevi Antoniani' probably), and XII †1499 '*haut dispar*' ('ex titulis Christianorum'), but is not found in the indices to C. I. L. I,<sup>2</sup> III–V (incl.), VII–X (incl.), XIV.

(b) *Evidence of MSS and Libri.*

Otto Ribbeck, *Scaenicae Romanorum Poesis Fragmenta*, vol. I (Tragicorum Fragm.), 1871, gives the following readings:—

*hauquaquam*, Att. 618.

*haud* in Ennius 330<sup>3</sup>; Pacuvius 325, 426<sup>3</sup>; inc. inc. fab. 30.<sup>3</sup>

*haut* in Livius 35; Enn. 340; Attius 108, 115, 193, 330, 360, 466; Fabul. Praetext. 31.

Otto Ribbeck, op. cit., vol. II (Comicorum Fragm.), 1873:—

*hau*, Liv. 3 (*haut* codices); Naev. 16 (*hau* om. libri); Titin. 181 (The MS has room for three letters only); Afran. 58 (*aut* libri); Pub. Syri Sententiae 461 (= 694) (reading very doubtful).

*haud*, Fabul. Palliat. inc. inc. 47<sup>4</sup>; Afranius 12<sup>4</sup>; Sententiae Turicenses 693 (= 850).

*haut*, Naevius 60, 112; Caecilius 181; Turpilius 9, 10; Fab. Pall. inc. inc. 74; Titinius 127, 166; Afran. 7, 51.

L. Müller, *Q. Enni Carminum Reliquiae* (1885), reads as follows:—

*haud*, Annales 278, 389, 578; Fabulae 127, 424 (= Ribbeck, vol. I, Enn. 340 *haut*, v. supra).

*haudquaquam*, Ann. 293.

*haut*, Ann. 499.

In connexion with Ribbeck's 'velut cum pro eo (s. c. *haut*) *aut*

<sup>1</sup> C. I. L. I 1007 (= also F. D. Allen, *Remnants of Early Latin*, No. 138, where it is included among 'Epitaphs dating from about the Gracchan period on') and I 1306 are among the "Inscriptiones a bello Hanniblico ad C. Caesaris mortem" (see Mommsen in C. I. L. I, pp. 5, 43), and they are, I believe, the only instances of the negative in question to be found in C. I. L. I.

<sup>2</sup> *haut* does not occur in C. I. L. I 1306, as might perhaps be at first sight inferred from Stolz, *Lat. Gr.*<sup>2</sup>, §69, p. 316. This particular inscription (quoted above in the text) shews '*haud licitum*,' with which contrast *haut licitum* in C. I. L. II 562 (also quoted in the text above).

<sup>3</sup> Wrongly placed under *haut* in Ribbeck's index to vol. I.

<sup>4</sup> Wrongly placed under *haut* in Ribbeck's index to vol. II.

positum est' we may note that in the following of the above-mentioned passages the reading *aut* is supported either by Libri or by at least one MS:

Ribbeck, op. cit., vol. I, Enn. 340; Pac. 426; Att. 108, 115, 193, 330.

Ribbeck, op. cit., vol. II, Naev. 60, 112; Turpil. 9, 10; Pall. inc. inc. 74; Titin. 166; Afran. 7, 12, 51, 58.

Müller, op. cit., Enn. Ann. 499; and Fab. 424 (= Ribbeck, op. cit., I, Enn. 340).

Ritschl, in his edition of Plautus, Trin. 1848, reads as follows (I add critical notes in brackets):

*hau* in lines 233 (*hau* A, ut videtur. *haud* reliqui), 462 (*hau* A, *haud* reliqui).<sup>1</sup>

*haut* in lines 60 (*haut* A, *haud* reliqui, et sic constanter nisi ubi contrarium testabimur); 62 (*haut* A. R., *haud* reliqui); 90 (*aut* H.); 115 (*haut* B, *haud* reliqui); 362 (*aut* A, *haud* reliqui); 445 (*haud* BCDE, *hau* Camerarius, *au* Palmerius Spicil., p. 859); 584 (*haud* dare Pius, *haddare* B, *addere* CDEZ); 625 (*haut* B, *haud* reliqui); 721 (*haud* Dousa iv. 24, Scaliger. *aut* libri); 835; 1157.

(c) *The opinions of the Ancient Grammarians.*

Marius Victorinus (flor. about 360 A. D.), according to the reading of Ritschl, Proleg. ad Plaut. Trinum., page c, writes:

"*Hau* adverbium est negandi et significat idem quod apud Graecos οὐ: sed ab antiquis cum adspiratione, ut alia quoque verba, dictum est et adiecta *d* littera, quam plerisque verbis adiciebant. *d* tamen litteram conservat, si sequens verbum incipiat a vocali ut *haud aliter muros* et *haud equidem*. at cum verbum a consonanti incipit, *d* perdit ut *hau dubiam* et *hau multa* et *hau placitura refer*."<sup>2</sup>

An alternative reading given by Ritschl (l. c.) runs as follows:

<sup>1</sup> To these statistics we may add that Georges, Lex. der Lat. Wortf., gives *hau* in Plaut. Bacch. 506; Men. 927; Most. 434, 720, 919; Pers. 11, 23, 500; Poen., Prol. 94; Pseud. 215. Nipperdey, Ritter read *hau* in Tacitus, Ann. (e. g.) II 36 and VI 43 (49).—P. S. Reference may profitably be made also to Friedr. Neue, Formenl. d. Lat. Spr. II<sup>8</sup> 664 sqq.

<sup>2</sup> The reading "at cum verbum a consonanti incipit, *d* perdit ut *haut dudum* et *haut multum* et *haut placitura refert*, et inducit *t*" cannot possibly stand. Keil's reading is, in the main, identical with that of Ritschl, and runs thus: "at cum sequens verbum a consonanti incipit, *d* perdit, ut *hau dudum* et *hau multum* et '*hau placitura refer*' [et inducit *t*]."



"*Haud* adverbium est negandi et significat idem quod apud Graecos οὐ, et fuit *au*: sed ab antiquis etc."<sup>1</sup>

Flavius Caper (flor. before the end of the 4th century A. D.), according to the reading of Keil, Gramm. Lat., vol. VII, p. 96, l. 4, writes:—

"*'hau dolo'* per *d* recte scribitur, etenim *d* inter duas vocales esse debet. quod si consonans sequitur, *d* addi non debet, ut '*hauscio*.'"<sup>2</sup>

Charisius (flor. some time between the middle of the 4th and end of the 5th centuries A. D.), Institut. Gramm., bk. I, §xv ad fin., after a brief discussion of the particle *sed*, continues:—

"*Haud* similiter *d* littera terminatur: *āu* enim Graeca vox<sup>3</sup> *d* littera termina[ri apud antiquos] coepit quibus mos erat *d* litt[eram omnibus] paene vocibus vocali littera finitis adiungere, ut *quo ted hoc noctis [dicam pro]ficisci foras*. Sed et per *t* scribi sonus vocis admittit."

Charisius thus gives authority also for the form *haut*.

#### *Results of the foregoing investigation.*

(i) The three forms *hau*, *haud*, *haut* are established by the united evidence of Inscriptions, MSS and Grammarians.

(ii) The earlier form of the Latin word under discussion seems beyond all reasonable doubt to have been *\*au*.

Thus we have before us Lat. *\*au* 'not': Gk. οὐ 'not'; and the problem is to find the connexion between them.

The explanation of the *h* and *d*: *t* of *hau* *haud*: *haut*, which have been shewn above to be non-original extensions of the earlier Latin form *\*au*, and the examination of the extensions of Gk. οὐ, viz. οὐ-κ οὐ-χ οὐ-κί οὐ-χί, will be deferred to the latter part of the present essay (§8, pp. 61 sqq.), where the various Latin

<sup>1</sup> This, with the omission of Ritschl's 'et fuit *au*,' is the reading given in Keil's Grammatici Latini, vol. VI, p. 15, ll. 21, 22.

<sup>2</sup> Keil gives the following critical note: "*haud olo per d recte scribitur* M (= Codex Montepessulanus 306); *haud dolo sic recte scribitur* C (= Codex Bernensis 338); *haud dolo sic aliqui recte scribitur* B (= Codex Bernensis 330); rectius erat *hau dolo per unum d recte scribitur*, nisi potius *haud aliter* scriptum erat, quod ex Vergilii versu Aen. VIII 65 Marius Victorinus p. 15, 24 adscripsit." Lindsay, The Latin Language, ch. II, §136, p. 122, suggests a new reading: *haud uolo*.

<sup>3</sup> Ritschl (l. c., p. ci) prefers to read "*hau* enim, graeca vox οὐ, *d* littera etc." Keil, Gramm. Lat., vol. I, p. 112, l. 8, and Lindsay, The Latin Language, ch. X, §18, read "οὐ enim Graeca vox *d* littera," etc.

and Greek extensions of the forms \**au* : οὐ, together with some kindred forms in the same or in some other Idg. languages, will be dealt with in detail.

### §3. Older explanations of *haud* : οὐ examined.

Before I venture to put forward my own views on the vocalism of Gk. οὐ and Lat. (*h*)*au*(*d*), it may be well to examine one or two of the older etymologies or explanations offered.

Corssen, *Ausspr. Vocalism. und Beton. d. Lat. Spr.*<sup>2</sup>, vol. I (1868), p. 205, regards the *au* of (*h*)*au*(*d*)<sup>1</sup> as the 'Pronominal Particle' *au*, which in *au-fero au-fugio* has the meaning 'away, apart,' and occurs also, according to Corssen, l. c., in Lat. *au-tem*, Osc. *av-ti*, Umbr. *o-te*, Lat. *au-t* (see id. ib., p. 157). This *au*, he says further, corresponds to Skr. *áva*, which properly means 'down, downwards,' but which, he adds (on the authority of Benfey, *Chrestom. Gloss.*, p. 32 f.), in composition often contains the pure negative meaning '-less, un-, not.' On the ground, too, that Pott (*Etymol. Forsch.*, part II, 1836, pp. 64, 134) identified Gk. οὐ-κ with Skr. *avā-k*, Corssen (l. c.) identifies Greek οὐ with the same Skr. *áva*,<sup>2</sup> which, according to him, has the form *au* in Lat. *h-au-d*.

Thus Corssen identifies the vocalism of Lat. (*h*)*au*(*d*), *au*(*fero*), *au*(*fugio*), *au*(*tem*), *au*(*t*), Umbr. *o*(*te*), Osc. *av*(*ti*), Skr. *áva*, Gk. οὐ. Leaving Lat. *h-au-d* and Gk. οὐ for the moment out of the question, it may be remarked that only on one condition—viz. that Skr. *áva* and the *au-* of Lat. *au-fero au-fugio* represent an Idg. *au* (a view which I believe to be right, v. infra, p. 50, n. 3.)—can we regard as correct Corssen's identification of these with Lat. *au*(*tem*), *au*(*t*), Umbr. *o*(*te*), Osc. *av*(*ti*), which must represent Idg. \**au* (see Brugmann, *Grundriss*, I, §§96, 97; Lindsay, *The Lat. Lang.*, ch. X, §§4, p. 599, 5, p. 601). If, therefore, Skr. *áva*, Lat. *au*(*fero*) *au*(*fugio*) *au*(*tem*) *au*(*t*), Umbr. *o*(*te*), Osc. *av*(*ti*) are all to be identified together as representing Idg. \**au*, they must all be separated from Gk. οὐ 'not' (which cannot represent Idg. \**au*), and probably, therefore, also from Lat. \**au* 'not.' Thus Corssen's identification of Gk. οὐ with Skr. *áva* [based on

<sup>1</sup> For Corssen's view on the *h* and *d* of *h-au-d* see below, §7 a and b, pp. 55, 59.

<sup>2</sup> Bopp (as I conclude from Brugmann, *Gr. Gr.*<sup>2</sup>, p. 236) was the first to identify Gk. οὐ with Skr. *áva*.

Pott's incorrect identification of Gk. *οὐκ* with Skr. *avāk* (on the latter syllable of which v. infra, §8, p. 63)] cannot possibly stand.

Osthoff, in Hübschmann's *Das Idg. Vocalsystem* (1885), pp. 190, 191, regards "Lat. (*h*)*aud* : Gk. *οὐ* (from \**oûd*)" as shewing different ablaut-grades of the same root. For the ablaut "Gk. *οὐ* : Lat. *au*" Osthoff, l. c., compares Gk. *οὔρα* (Att. *ῶρα* from \**ǵara*) : Lat. *auris*, from Idg. *\*aus-* 'to draw, gather, take, obtain' [Gk. *αὔω* Lat. *haurio* (from \**aus-iō*, Osthoff, *Zur Geschichte des Perfects*, p. 486) O.Norse *ausa*],<sup>1</sup> the 'ear' thus meaning 'the grasping organ'—middle grade of Gk. *οὐς* in Lesb. *παρ-οὐά* 'cheek' and weak grade in Avest. *uši-*.<sup>2</sup>

Osthoff's derivation of Gk. *οὐ* from \**oûd* seems unlikely. It is much more probable that *οὐ* was the earliest Greek form, and that the forms such as *οὐδ-εις* shewing *δ* came in later (cf. Brugmann, *Gr. II*, §31 ad fin.). With respect to Osthoff's view that Lat. *haud* Gk. *οὐ* belong to the *ǣ*-series, I would not deny that *δ* appears beside *ǣ* in the strong grade of this series,<sup>3</sup> but I would raise the objection that there is (so to speak) no Indo-Germanic 'peg' on which to hang Lat. *haud* Gk. *οὐ*, thus referred to the *ǣ*-series.

Victor Henry, in *Mém. d. l. Soc. d. Ling.*, vol. VI, part 5 (1889), pp. 378 sqq., seeks (*unsuccessfully*, I think) to justify Bopp's and Corsen's above-mentioned identification of Skr. *áva* with Gk. *οὐ*. He observes that at first sight the disparity of *meaning* between *áva* and *οὐ* is difficult, but remarks (on p. 378) that it is possible to see in Skr. the commencement of the proceeding, by which

<sup>1</sup> It should be mentioned that Havet, in *Mém. de la Soc. d. Ling. de Paris*, vol. VI, part I (1885), p. 18, and King and Cookson, *Sounds and Inflections in Greek and Latin*, chh. V, p. 86, IX, p. 187, regard Idg. \**ous-* as the origin of Lat. *auris* Gk. *οὐς*. But these scholars seem certainly to be mistaken in their view. Cf. Osthoff, *Perf.*, pp. 486 sqq.; Hübschmann, *Das Idg. Vocals.*, p. 159; Lindsay, *The Latin Language*, ch. IV, §31, and the present writer in his *Essay on the 'Establishment and Extension of the Law of Thurneysen and Havet,' Part II* (*Amer. Journ. of Philology*, vol. XVII, part 2, July, 1896), §8, p. 194, n. 3.

<sup>2</sup> Till recently 'understanding' was the only known meaning of Avest. *uši-* (cf. Armen. *uš* 'understanding,' regarded as a borrowed word by Hübschmann, *Arm. Stud. I*, p. 47), but the meaning 'ear' has been established by the new fragments of the 'Nirangistan,' vid. Darmesteter, *Le Zend-Avesta*, fragment vi, verse 26, p. 95 *hvaēiḥya ušīḥya* 'with the two ears.'

<sup>3</sup> Cf. the above-mentioned *Essay on the 'Establishment and Extension of the Law of Thurneysen and Havet,' Part I* (*A. J. P.*, vol. XVI, part 4, Dec. 1895), §3 (p. 447, note 1).

*áva*, "qui a parfois en sanscrit le sens inversif," has been capable of transformation into a negative particle. But to pass on to what is perhaps more important, his attempted explanation of the *form* of the words:—he suggests that *áva* may have come from an Idg. \**ouo-* [adding that Latin is not against this, seeing that the shortened form *au-* (*au-fero*, etc.), in virtue of the Law of Thurneysen and Havet, may represent Idg. \**ou* just as well as Idg. \**au*]. The Old Irish preposition *ó úa* (sic<sup>1</sup>), which comes from Idg. \**ou*, would correspond to Skr. *áva*, if this latter be rightly derived from Idg. \**ou(ō)*.<sup>2</sup> According to Brugmann's law that Idg. *ō* in an open syllable becomes *ā* in Skr., Victor Henry would have expected Idg. \**ouō* to become Skr. \**āvā*, and not Skr. *áva*, adding, however, that this rule is not absolute, being violated notably in the particles, e. g. Skr. *ápa* : Gk. *ἀπό*; he further explains *áva* by supposing the co-existence of two original forms, a full one \**ouō* (or \**ouā* or \**ouē*), and a shortened one \**ou* (with which he compares Lat. *au-*), the former yielding Skr. \**āvā* (or \**āvā*), the latter yielding Skr. \**āv*, and contamination of the two producing *āvā*. So far as Ionic Attic alone is concerned, Victor

<sup>1</sup> *úa* (as accentuated by Victor Henry), which should strictly represent *ūa* (for the 'accent,' which is written in Gaelic, is really no accent at all, but only a mark of quantity), may be criticised as not being quite an exact way of representing the true sound of the word. Some diphthongs in Gaelic may be (1) short, (2) long with respect to the first vowel, (3) long with respect to the second, but there are also (4) a few others, which are *always long*; to this latter class *ua* belongs. Diphthongs of this latter class are never 'accentuated'; thus *úa*, as written by V. Henry, is both right and wrong—wrong with respect to the notation, right with respect to the quantity (*ua* being a long diphthong).

The form *o* belongs to Scots (as well as Irish) Gaelic, e. g. *o urnuigh* 'from prayer,' St. Luke xxii. 45; *o Ghalile* 'from Galilee,' id. xxiii. 5. (This *o* of Scots Gaelic is of course long, as in Irish Gaelic, but Scots Gaelic very rarely makes use of the 'accent.') The form *ua*, however, is, so far as I know, peculiar to Irish, and even there is, I believe, retained only in the prepositional pronouns which are formed with this preposition, e. g. *uaim* (= *ua + me*) 'from me,' *uit* (= *ua + tu*) 'from thee' [all the simple prepositions in Irish being thus compounded with the personal pronouns, an odd feature common to Gaelic and the totally unrelated languages, Hebrew (e. g. *Immanu-el* 'with-us God') and, I am told, Hungarian]. Of *ua* I can find no trace in Scots Gaelic. Curiously enough, in O'Donovan's Irish Dictionary, the only form given of the preposition in question is *ua*, but the form *ō* (= *ō*) is now almost invariably written, even in printing old texts which shew *ua*.

<sup>2</sup> See *infra*, §4, p. 52, n. 1.

Henry observes that *ov* might come from the full form *\*δF<sub>o</sub>*,<sup>1</sup> but that as this would not suit Lesb., Boeot. and Doric, in which the said *\*δF<sub>o</sub>* would have become *\*ω*, he prefers to derive *ov* from the shortened form *\*δF* (comparing *πάρ* = *παρά*, *ἄν* = *ἀνά*, etc.), which satisfies all the phonetic needs, the *F* before consonants forming a diphthong with the preceding vowel, so that, e. g., *\*δF* *φᾱμ* (which, according to V. Henry, = Skr. *āva bhāmi*) became *ov* *φημ*.

On Victor Henry's theory the following remarks may be made. He is surely wrong in supposing that Brugmann's law, viz. that "Idg. *δ* in open syllables became *ā* in the Prim. Aryan period" (Brugmann, Gr. I, §78), is intended to include final syllables, for Brugmann himself, in Gr. III, §409, regards Skr. *sá* (: Gk. *δ*) *sá-s* as the Skr. representative of Idg. *\*sδ* *\*sδ-s*, and in Gr. IV, §1047, he exemplifies Idg. *\*-sδ*, an Idg. personal ending of the 2 sing. middle, by Avest. *bara-ṇha* (: Gk. *φέρεο φέρον ἐ-φέρεο ἐ-φέρον*); thus we should have expected Victor Henry's postulated Idg. *\*δμδ* to yield Skr. *\*āvā*, and not (as Victor Henry thinks) Skr. *\*āvā*. To return to the main question:—his suggested explanation, that Skr. *āva* arose by the contamination of two original Idg. forms *\*δμδ* (or *\*δμᾶ* or *\*δμῆ*) and *\*δμ*, does not seem at all satisfactory, and consequently I would reject the view that Skr. *āva* is the outcome of an Idg. form containing *\*δμ*. In the next place, although I believe firmly in the truth of the Law of Thurneysen and Havet,<sup>2</sup> I yet think that the *au-* of Lat. *au-fero au-fugio* is not an instance illustrative of this Law. Much rather, Skr. *āva* and the *au-* in these two Latin verbs (compare together Lat. *au-fero* : Skr. *ava-bhṛ-* 'aufero'), together with O.C.Sl. *u-* Pruss. *au-* 'off, away' (e. g. O.C.Sl. *u-myti* 'to wash off,' *u-dati* 'to give away, ἐκδοῦναι θυσίατα', Pruss. *au-mu-sna-n* 'ablution'), should all be regarded as representatives of the Idg. preposition *\*au(e)*. Cf. Brugmann, Gr. I, §100; Stolz, Lat. Gr.<sup>2</sup> (1890), §50, p. 293, and in the Historische Grammatik der Lateinischen Sprache, vol. I, part I (1894), §151, p. 154; Lindsay, The Latin Language (1894), ch. IX, §12, p. 576.<sup>3</sup> From this Idg. prepo-

<sup>1</sup> It is curious to compare the representation in Cyprian, viz. *o-vo* (v. Cauer, Delect. Inscr. Graec. 474, line 3).

<sup>2</sup> See the above-mentioned Essay on the 'Establishment and Extension of the Law of Thurneysen and Havet' (Amer. Journ. of Philology, vol. XVI, part 4, Dec. 1895, and vol. XVII, part 2, July, 1896).

<sup>3</sup> M. Bréal, in Mém. de la Soc. de Ling., vol. V, part 3 (1883), pp. 197, 198, maintains that the *au-* of *au-fero au-fugio* is the preposition *ab* or *ā* (cf. *abstuli, ablatum*). According to M. Bréal, "l'*ā* a subi la diphthongaison en *āu* comme

sition \*au(e), Gk. οὐ and (in my opinion) Lat. *h-au-d* must be entirely separated.

§4. *Reference of Lat. \*au Gk. οὐ to a common ground-form, namely, Idg. tautosyllabic \*δῡ, from the Idg. √eu- 'to fail, be deficient, be wanting.'*

The views hitherto advanced on the etymology of Gk. οὐ and Lat. *h-au-d* have thus been briefly criticised. None of them seems at all satisfactory. I would therefore venture to suggest the following view, which has, at least, the advantage of attaching Gk. οὐ and Lat. *h-au-d* to an established Idg. root with a well-defined meaning. According to my view, Gk. οὐ and Lat. (*h*)au(*d*) are identical in origin, their Idg. ground-form being tautosyllabic \*δῡ. This Idg. \*δῡ became regularly in Greek οὐ, in Latin first \*ou and then at a later date, some time in the 3d century B. C.,<sup>1</sup> \*au. Granting, then, that Gk. οὐ and Lat. \*au

---

*Lārentia* est devenu *Laurentia*." He relies mainly on the authority of Cicero, Orat. XLVII, §158: "Quid, si etiam 'abfugit' turpe visum est et 'abfer' noluerunt, ('aufugit' et) 'aufer' maluerunt? quae praepositio praeter haec duo verba nullo alio in verbo reperietur." He might much more appropriately (from his own point of view) have cited Quintil. I 5, §69: "Frequenter autem praepositiones quoque compositio ista corrumpit: inde *abstulit, aufugit, amisit*, cum praepositio sit *ab* sola." Such a view, however, can hardly be regarded as correct; cf. the authorities cited in the text, especially Lindsay, l. c., where, speaking of the *au-* in *au-fero* and *au-fugio*, he writes: "It has not been produced from *ab* by any phonetic process, but represents a different I.-Eur. preposition \*aw(ē) (O.Ind. *dva*, Pruss. *au-*, e. g. O.Ind. *ava-bhr-* 'au-fero'), which was brought into requisition in these compounds before an initial *f* to avoid confusion with the compounds of *ad*, e. g. *affero*." With this explanation of Lindsay, I would agree entirely, save in one point:—Surely the *au-* of *au-fero au-fugio* was not "brought into requisition" by Latin "to avoid confusion with the compounds of *ad*, e. g. *affero*," but rather is a relic preserved from Idg. times (cf. Skr. *ava-bhr-*, quoted above), long before the Idg. *bh* of the two Idg. roots *bher-* and *bheṃ-* had become Latin *f* (*fero fugio*). It would be more true, therefore, to say that the *au-* of *au-fero au-fugio* was maintained in Latin "to avoid confusion with the compounds of *ad*," a confusion which would have ensued if *au* had been exchanged for *ab* (e. g. *aufero* exchanged for *ab-fero*, whence, of course, *affero*, which would have been ambiguous).

<sup>1</sup> See the above-mentioned Essay on the 'Establishment and Extension of the Law of Thurneysen and Havet,' Part I (A. J. P., vol. XVI, part 4), §3 ad fin. (pp. 456 sq.), Part II (A. J. P., vol. XVII, part 2), §8 ad fin. (p. 195) and §9 (pp. 195 sq.).

come from Idg. tautosyllabic *\*ǵu*, we have next to ask: What can this Idg. *\*ǵu* mean? So far as I am aware, no one has yet suggested any Idg. root with a known and definite meaning, with which to connect this Idg. *\*ǵu*; but there exists one Idg. root, the meaning of which is well established, and from which there are numerous derivatives, a root which exactly suits the needs required of it here, both as to form and meaning: the Idg. *√eu-* 'to fail, be deficient, be wanting.' To this Idg. *√eu-*, therefore, I would refer, as preserving the strong grade *ǵ* of the *ǵ*-series, Idg. tautosyllabic *\*ǵu*, the common ground-form of Gk. *οὐ* and Lat. (*h*)*au(d)*.

From this derivation we can easily trace the development of meaning. In Gk. *οὐ* and Lat. *h-au-d* the idea of 'want' or 'deficiency' has produced the purely negative meaning. In Old Irish *ó ua* 'away from,' if connected herewith (as is quite possible from the phonetic point of view<sup>1</sup>), the meaning has further developed through the idea of 'absence' or 'separation' implied in the primitive root.<sup>2</sup>

#### §5. Other derivatives of the Idg. *√eu-*.

The meaning of this Idg. *√eu-* 'to fail, to be wanting,' which is thus given by Brugmann, Gr. II, §66, p. 141 (Engl. ed.), §67, p. 153 (E. E.), and Osthoff in Morph. Untersuch. IV, p. 370, is well established from the following derivatives, most of which will be found in Brugmann, Gr. I, §63, II, §66, p. 141 (E. E.), §67, p. 153, §95, p. 286, III, §175, p. 25 (E. E.), IV, §574, and in Fick, Vergl. Wörterb. d. Idg. Spr.<sup>3</sup>, part I, p. 123, s. v. "*va* 'mangeln,

<sup>1</sup> O. Ir. *ó ua* can represent either Idg. tautosyllabic *\*ǵu* or *\*ǵu* (v. Brugmann, Gr. I, §§66, 82), but *not* Idg. tautosyllabic *\*ǵu* (v. Brugmann, Gr. I, §98).

<sup>2</sup> If my derivation of Gk. *οὐ* Lat. (*h*)*au(d)* from Idg. tautosyllabic *\*ǵu* from Idg. *√eu-* 'to fail, to be deficient, to be wanting'—a derivation to which no exception can possibly be taken from the point of view of the meaning—is correct, it will hardly be denied that this is an example very strongly supporting the views set forth in the above-mentioned Essay on the 'Establishment and Extension of the Law of Thurneysen and Havet.' For according to no system of ablaut can an *original* (i. e. Idg.) *ǵ* appear in the Idg. *ǵ*-series, to which the Idg. *√eu-* (: Gk. *εἰ-νι-ς* 'bereft, mulcted,' etc.) undoubtedly belongs. See Hübschmann, Idg. Vocalsystem (1885); Brugmann, Gr. I (1886), §309 and §§311-14; Bartholomae in Bezzenberger's Beiträge, vol. XVII (1891), pp. 91 sqq. Cf. also P. Giles, Short Manual of Comparative Philology (1895), §§258-265, and the Note following §265, pp. 186-94.

fehlen,'" part II, p. 179, s. v. "ū 'mangeln,'" part III, p. 542, s. v. "vā 'mangeln'":

Avestic root *ū*<sup>1</sup> 'to want,' *ūyamna* pple. mid. 'wanting, failing,' *ūna* 'empty' also subst. f. 'want.' Sanskrit *ūnā*-<sup>2</sup> 'defective, deficient in something,' *ūnay* 'to leave (a wish) unfulfilled (*ūnā*-),' based on *ūnā*-.<sup>3</sup> Armenian *unain* 'empty.'<sup>4</sup> Greek *εὐ-νι-ς* 'bereft, mulcted.' Latin *vānus, vācare, vācuus*.<sup>5</sup> Gothic<sup>6</sup> *v-an-s* 'wanting, absent, lacking,' *v-an n.* 'want.' O.H.G. *w-an* 'wanting, lacking.' English *wan*- 'lacking, without.'<sup>8</sup>

To the derivatives just given may be added, I. Greek *ἄν-ευ* 'without' and II. (1) Skr. *vā* Gk. *\*-Fε* Lat. *-vε* 'or,' (2) Skr. *vā* 'as, like,' Gk. *\*-Fε* 'as, like as,' Lat. *\*-vε* 'as, like as,' for a full discussion of which see the paper on "Some Sanskrit, Greek and Latin Derivatives of the Idg. *√ey-* 'to fail, to be deficient, to be wanting,'" published recently in Bezzenberger's *Beiträge*, vol. XXII, 3/4 (1896), pp. 189-202.

<sup>1</sup> Cf. also, in addition to the authorities cited in the text, Grassmann, *Wörterb. zum RV.*, s. v. (*ūnā*), col. 272.

<sup>2</sup> *ūnā* is apparently not used independently in the RV. (vid. Grassmann), but it is found in the compound *ān-ūna* 'not defective, perfect' [cf. also *ānūna-varcas* 'possessing perfect glory (*vārcas*),' Grassmann, *Wörterb. zum RV.*, col. 61 and 272]. *ūna* is found independent in classical Sanskrit, e. g. (Raghuvansa) *ūnam na sattvēṣv adhiko babādhe* 'a strong one amongst animals has not hurt a weak (or inferior) one.' *ūna* is frequently used to form phrases of subtraction in the numerals, e. g. 19 *ekōnaviṣṭatiṣ* (from *eka-ūna-viṣṭatiṣ* 'a score wanting one') and *ūnaviṣṭatiṣ*, 57 *tryūnaṣaṣṭiṣ* (see Whitney, *Skr. Gr.*, §§477a, 478b; Brugmann, *Gr. III*, §175, p. 25, E. E.).

<sup>3</sup> Cf. also Grassmann, *op. cit.*, s. v. (*ūnā*), col. 272.

<sup>4</sup> Cf. also Hübschmann, *Arm. Stud.* I (1883), pp. 47, 62.

<sup>5</sup> On these Latin words cf. also the above-mentioned Essay on the 'Establishment and Extension of the Law of Thurneysen and Havet,' Part II (A. J. P., vol. XVII, part 2), §6 (pp. 178 sqq.).

<sup>6</sup> With the above-mentioned use of Skr. *ūna*, to form phrases of subtraction in the numerals, we may compare the similar phenomenon in Gothic, e. g. 2 Cor. 11, 24 *fidvōr tiguns dīnamma vanans* 'forty save one' (cited by Brugmann, *Gr. III*, §175, p. 25, E. E.).

<sup>7</sup> Cf. also Osthoff in *Morph. Unters.* IV, p. 375.

<sup>8</sup> E. g. *wanton* from M.E. *wan-* from A.S. *wan* 'lacking,' and *towen* = A.S. *toġen*, past pple. of *teōn* 'to draw, to educate' (v. Skeat, *Concise Etym. Dict. of the Engl. Lang.*, 1887), 'lacking or without education.' Cf. also the following, cited by R. C. Trench (*English Past and Present*, Lect. III, p. 112, and note on pp. 112, 113): *wanhope* 'despair,' *wanthrift* 'extravagance,' *wanluck* 'misfortune,' *wanlust* 'languor,' *wanwit* 'folly,' *wangracc* 'wickedness,' *wantrust* (Chaucer) 'distrust.'



§6. *The ablaut "ou : eu" in Greek.*

The ablaut *ou : eu* in Greek is not common; few examples are known; but it must have existed originally in Prim. Greek, none the less; and an isolated word like *οἶ* is just such as might have been expected to keep its original 'vocalismus,' untouched by external influences. The following<sup>1</sup> are examples of the ablaut *ou : eu* in Greek:

σπουδῇ : σπεύδω,<sup>2</sup>  
 πλοῦ-το-ς : √ *pl-em*,-<sup>3</sup>  
 ἀκόλουθος : κέλευθος.<sup>4</sup>  
 λοῦσσον<sup>5</sup> : λεύσσω<sup>6</sup> from \**λευκ-ιω* √ *leuq-* 'lucere,'<sup>7</sup>  
 εἰληλουθ-ε<sup>8</sup> }  
 εἰληλουθ-μεν } : root *ελευθ-* (fut. *ελεύσομαι*, *ελευστέον*).<sup>9</sup>  
 εἰληλουθ-ώς }

In *θός* : *θείω*, *πλός* : *πλέω*, *χός* : *χέω*, etc., the sonantal element became at an early period consonantal.<sup>10</sup>

<sup>1</sup> I omit the late word *ρόσιος* 'reddish,' which Schleicher, Comp. 67, derived from \**ροίθιος*, and placed beside *ερεύθω*, but wrongly so, *ρόσιος* being really a borrowed word, Lat. *rusus russeus*. Cf. G. Meyer, Gr. Gr.<sup>2</sup>, §9, p. 9.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. Hübschmann, Das Idg. Vocalsystem (1885), §165, p. 116; Brugmann, Gr. I, §80, p. 72, Engl. ed.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. Brugmann, Gr. Gr.<sup>2</sup>, §70, p. 96.

<sup>4</sup> Cf. Hübschmann, Das Idg. Vocals., p. 116, and especially J. Schmidt, 'Assimilationen benachbarter einander nicht berührender Vocale,' in Kuhn's Zeitschr. XXXII, p. 325, who there observes that only one *o* in *ἀκόλουθος* can be occasioned by ablaut. A comparison of *ἀκόλουθος* with *κέλευθος* proves, as Schmidt rightly says, that the ablaut syllable is that containing the diphthong. Schmidt considers the original flexion to have been \**ακελενθος* nom., *ακολούθου* gen., and levelling to have thence ensued in the historical time.

<sup>5</sup> *λοῦσσον* 'the pith of the fir-tree,' first attested by Theophrastus, H. P. 3. 9. 7.

<sup>6</sup> Cf. G. Meyer, Gr. Gr.<sup>2</sup>, §9, p. 9.

<sup>7</sup> The *eu* of *λευκός* 'white' cannot be original, but has come in for older *ou* (\**λουκός*); cf. G. Meyer, Gr. Gr.<sup>2</sup>, §9, p. 9; Prellwitz, Etym. Wörterb. d. Griech. Spr., p. 185, s. v. *λοῦσσον*; and Bartholomae in Bezz. Beitr. XVII, p. 99.

<sup>8</sup> In the Idg. perfect the *δ*-grade prevailed in the 2. 3. sing. indic. act. (*οἶσθα οἶδε* √ *meid-*) and, according to the view of most linguists, in the 1. sing. as well [*οἶδα*, \**πεφονγα* (in Fick, Vergl. Wörterb.<sup>4</sup>, p. 89, read \**bhébouga* for \**bhébauga*, cf. id. ib., p. xxxv), from √ *bheug-* or √ *bhem-* 'to bend, decline'], although some think that the *ε*-grade prevailed in the 1. sing. (e. g. *πέφονγα*). On this question cf. Brugmann, Gr. IV, §843.

<sup>9</sup> Cf. Hübschmann, Das Idg. Vocals., p. 116; Brugmann, Gr. I, §77, p. 68 (Engl. ed.), §80, p. 72 (Engl. ed.), IV, §856; id. Gr. Gr.<sup>2</sup>, §9, p. 26; and G. Meyer, Gr. Gr.<sup>2</sup>, §552, p. 484.

<sup>10</sup> Cf. G. Meyer, Gr. Gr.<sup>2</sup>, §9, p. 9.

B.—THE EXTENSIONS OF LAT. \**au* AND OF GK. οὐ ‘NOT.’

Having thus examined thoroughly the vocalism of Gk. οὐ and Lat. \**au* ‘not,’ and having referred them to the common Idg. ground-form \**ou*, representing the strong-grade *o* of the *ē*-series, from the Idg. √ *eu-* ‘to fail, be deficient, be wanting,’ we will now proceed to discuss the extensions of Lat. \**au*, viz. *h-au*, *h-au-d*, *h-au-t*, and also of Gk. οὐ, viz. οὐ-χί, οὐχ, οὐ-κί, οὐ-κ, together with some other kindred forms in the same or in other Idg. languages.

§7. *Latin h-au h-au-d h-au-t*.—(a) the *h* of *h-au h-au-d h-au-t*; (b) the *d* of *h-au-d*; (c) the *t* of *h-au-t*.

(a) *The h of h-au h-au-d h-au-t*.

The explanation of this *h*- is no easy matter. Various explanations have been offered; but none seems convincing:—

Corssen, *Ausspr. Vocalism. und Beton. d. Lat. Spr.*<sup>2</sup>, vol. I (1868), p. 205, regards *haud* as a compound word, consisting of three parts: *h-*, *au*, *d*. His explanation of the *au-* as the ‘Pronominal Particle’ meaning ‘away, apart,’ considered above (§3, pp. 47 sqq.), did not appear satisfactory. For his explanation of the *-d*, see below (p. 59). The *h-*, according to him, is the remnant of the demonstrative pronominal stem *ho-* of *hi-c* *hae-c* *ho-c*, which appears blunted to *h-* in *h-or-nu-s* from \**ho-ior-nu-s* ‘this year’s.’<sup>1</sup> Thus, according to his theory, *h-au* must = literally ‘this away,’ and would be a formation similar to Skr. *só* (contracted from Skr. *sá u*) Old Pers. *hauv* Gk. οὐ[-τος] from Idg. \**so* (demonstrative pronoun) + *u* (the particle of place, meaning ‘here’ or ‘there’).<sup>2</sup> Thus, while Idg. \**so u* strictly means ‘this man here,’ Lat. \**ho-au*, according to Corssen’s explanation, would mean just the opposite, ‘this away, this not here.’ Although Corssen’s etymology of the *au* did not seem satisfactory, this need not really affect our view concerning his explanation of the *h-*, which, if suitable to the *au* as derived by Corssen, might be equally suitable to the *au* as derived in the present paper (v. supra, §4, p. 51). That Corssen’s explanation of the *h-* is possible may be admitted; but at the same time it can hardly be considered satisfactory.

<sup>1</sup> This Latin stem *ho-* is generally extended by *-ce* (*hic* = \**ho-i-ce*), but *ho-die* *ho-rum* and Falisc. *hei he* = ‘heic hic’ (Schneider, *Dial. Ital. Exx. Select.*, vol. I, part 2, p. 106, Nos. 20, 21a, 22) are instances of the unextended root (v. Stolz, *Lat. Gr.*<sup>2</sup>, §90, p. 347).

<sup>2</sup> Cf. Brugmann, *Gr. I*, §603 ad fin., II, §4, p. 9, E. E., III, §414, p. 337, E. E.

Osthoff, *Zur Geschichte des Perfects* (1884), Excurs III, on 'Indog. *says-*, *aus-*, *eys-* im griechischen,' has on pp. 491, 492 worked out an ingenious theory to explain (1) the incorrect presence of *h* in *h-auriō* (for *\*aus-iō*, Osthoff, *ib.*, p. 486) : Gk. *αῦω*, Old Norse *aus-a* 'to draw, obtain,' *h-umerus* : the correct *umerus*, *h-erus* : the correct *erus*, *h-ālāre h-ālītus* : the correct *ālum ālāre*, and (2) the incorrect absence of *h* in *anser* : Skr. *hṣá-* Gk. *χίψ*, *arēna* : the correct but less frequent *harēna* (= Sab. *fasēna*), *olus* : the correct *holus*. Osthoff, it is true, makes here no mention of *haud*, but inasmuch as this theory of Osthoff is cited in Hübschmann, *Das Idg. Vocalsystem* (1885), p. 191, in explanation of the *h-* of *h-aud*, we must briefly review the theory to see whether it can be applied to *h-aud*. Osthoff explains the incorrect presence and absence of the *h* as the outcome of sentence-doublets. He suggests that, e. g., Lat. *ex harēnā*, *in harēnā* came to be pronounced *ec s-arēnā*, *i n-arēnā* (cf. French *là z-om* = *les hommes*), the spiritus asper having disappeared after the new consonant thus prefixed. But elsewhere, he says, and especially at the beginning of a sentence, the spiritus asper will have maintained itself unweakened, so that in such a position only *harena* *\*hanser holus* were pronounced. But inasmuch as in phrases like *ec s-arēnā*, *i n-arēnā* the *h*, though no longer pronounced, continued still to be written, confusion arose, followed by the not unfrequent wrong insertion of *h*; the pronunciation was not altered when the *h* was wrongly written in cases like *exhālāre inhālāre*, just as in *humero*.

This theory may or may not give the correct explanation of the words discussed, but it is difficult to consider it applicable to the negative *h-aud* 'not,' which can but rarely have been preceded by *ex* or *in*.

Bugge, *Beiträge zur Erforschung der Etruskischen Sprache*, in *Bezz. Beitr.* X (1886), pp. 75, 76, attempts to prove that the *h* of the Latin demonstrative stem *ho-* was merely 'vorgeschoben.' Latin, he says, does not know an inflected demonstrative stem *o-*, but rather *ho-* : *hoc* (from *\*hod-ce*), *hunc* and so forth. But, he continues, no other Idg. language shews an inflected stem *ho-* or *gho-*, and it is well known that Latin sometimes shews a 'vorgeschoben *h*' (e. g. *h-aurio*, where the related Etruscan words *husrnana huzrnatre* likewise shew *h*), hence he regards the *h* of the Latin demonstrative stem *ho-* as 'vorgeschoben,' and identifies formally *\*hom* (contained in Lat. *hunc*) with Etrusc. *am*, *an*.

Bugge thinks that the older unaspirated forms *\*om* *\*am* *\*od* were aspirated because they were felt to be too unsubstantial, when the pronoun was in an accented position. He accordingly felt himself able to identify Lat. *hō*[-*die*] with the synonymous Skr. *a*[-*dyā*]. In his discussion of Lat. *haud* itself, he appears to call it 'a word of pronominal origin' and says that "if the *h* of *haud* is of the same origin as the *h* of *haurio*, *hic*, *hodic*, then *haud*, as has long been conjectured, may be related to Gk. οὐ."

It is difficult to see whether Bugge means that the *h* of *h-aud* is the 'vorgeschoben *h*' of the demonstrative stem *h-o-* (according to his own explanation of the latter), or that it is a 'vorgeschoben *h*,' as in *h-aurio*, quite unconnected with the demonstrative stem *ho-*. He apparently means the former, in which case his explanation is much the same as that of Corssen, given above, and no more satisfactory. Moreover, Bugge is, I think, quite wrong in regarding the *h-* of the demonstrative stem *ho-* as a 'vorgeschoben *h-*.'<sup>1</sup> Much rather does the Lat. *ho-* represent an Idg. stem *\*ǵho-* (v. infra, §8, p. 62).

Lindsay, *The Latin Language* (1894), ch. X, §18, suggests that the initial *h-* of *haud* must have been used as a distinguishing mark to differentiate the word from *aut*, comparing M. Valerius Probus (temp. Nero and the Flavian Caesars), *Inst. Art.*, in Keil's *Gramm. Lat.*, vol. IV, p. 145, l. 9: "'*aut*,' si sine adspiratione scribatur et in *t* litteram exeat, erit coniunctio; si vero '*haud*' cum adspiratione scribatur et in *d* litteram exeat, erit adverbium." We might compare also Cledonius (flor. 5th century A. D.) in Keil, op. cit., vol. V, p. 74, l. 28: "*aut* si sine *h* aspiratione et in *t* exit, coniunctio est; si vero cum *h* aspiratione et in *d* exit, adverbium"; and Cassiodorus (circ. 500 A. D.), *De Orthographia*, in Keil, op. cit., vol. VII, p. 158, l. 20: "*Haud*, quando adverbium est negandi, *d* littera terminatur et adspiratur in capite; quando autem coniunctio disiunctiva est, per *t* litteram sine adspiratione

<sup>1</sup> It is quite true that we find unaspirated forms on inscriptions fairly often, e. g. *ic* in C. I. L. III 809; IV 1321; V 6400; VIII 5257, 5501, 8297, 9344, 9638, 9768; X 7123, 7172, 7763. *ic* XII 870. *oc* V 4488; VIII 9192; X 1541. *uc* (= *oc*) XII †2147. *unc* V †1642; IX 306 (bis); XII 2584. *uius* V †1741; VIII 9200; X 2184, 4410. *ei*? I 1297. *aduc* V †6244. But these unaspirated forms (which do not occur on any early inscription) are not the survival of an original unaspirated demonstrative stem; they are due merely to the incorrect 'dropping of *h*,' as is proved by the fact that the aspirated, not the unaspirated, forms occur in the earliest inscriptions, e. g. *hunc* and *hic* in C. I. L. I 32 (of 253 B. C. circ.).

scribitur." Albinus Magister, in Keil, op. cit., vol. VII, p. 303, l. 3, uses identically the same words as Cassiodorus, only differing from them by the insertion of the word '*aut*' before '*per t litteram*.'

We can scarcely accept Lindsay's explanation of the *h-* of *h-aud*. The grammarians are merely stating linguistic facts, and not advancing theories. Had the usual form of the word been *haut*, the aspiration might in that case have been used, as Lindsay suggests, to distinguish *h-aud* 'not' from *aut* 'or.' But this was not the case. *haut* is very rare on inscriptions, and quite late, the only two inscriptions, on which I have been able to discover it, being respectively 'aevi Antoniani' and 'ex titulis Christianorum' (v. supra, §2, p. 43). The aspiration is already on the earlier and more usual *haud* and on the still earlier form *hau* (v. supra, §2). Hence we must find an explanation of the *h-* which will suit the earlier forms *hau*, *haud*, irrespective of the later *haut*.

The only ancient grammarian, who did not confine himself (like those just quoted) to the statement of the fact that "*aut* 'or' is a conjunction, *haud* 'not' an adverb" or the like, is Marius Victorinus, whose remark (quoted above, §2, p. 45) is: "*Hau* adverbium est negandi et significat idem quod apud Graecos οὐ [et fuit *au*]: sed ab antiquis cum adspiratione, ut alia quoque verba, dictum est." Marius Victorinus would thus seem to regard the *h-* of *h-aud* as a mere 'vorgeschoben *h*.'

Instances of *h* 'vorgeschoben' are numerous on inscriptions, e. g.:

*haegregius* in C. I. L. V †1709; *hominum* XIV 3323; *heterna* V †1720; *hegit* V 7647; *hordo* IX 5577, X 477; *haliquit* (= *aliquid*) XII 915; *Hillyricus* V 3620; *hac* III 5839, IX 5961, X 7995; *his* XIV 497; *heius* III 3917, VIII 3520; *hil(l)ic* XII 915; *have* IV 1983, 2148.

Compare also Catullus' poem (No. 84) on Arrius, whom he represents as speaking *hinsidias* and *Hionios* instead of *insidias* and *Iontios*. To say nothing of inscriptions, this poem alone is sufficient to prove the fluctuation of *h* in Latin as early as the first century B. C.; while a century later Quintilian (I 6, 21) laughs at those, as affected, who greet one another with *avē* instead of *h-avē* on account of the derivation from *avēre* (cf. Blass, Ausspr. d. Griech.<sup>3</sup>, §25, and Corssen, Ausspr. Voc. und Beton. d. Lat. Spr.<sup>2</sup>, vol. I, p. 104).<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Both forms are found on inscriptions: *have* (v. supra in text); *ave* in C. I. L. XIV 1473, *avete* IV 2071.

For the converse we may compare *ic*, etc. (quoted above, p. 57, n. 1), and also *arrespex*<sup>1</sup> in C. I. L. I 1216; *erceiscunda* I 205, part 2, 55 (48 B. C.); *Irtius* I 625 (42 B. C. circa), IX 3771; *Oratia*<sup>2</sup> I 924; *ostia* (for *hostia*) I 819; *Osti(lius)* I 1170; *Ypsaeus* I 467 bis (57 B. C. circa); also numerous instances of the common verb *habeo* docked of its *h*, e. g. *abes* V 1712; *abis* (= *abes*) VIII 9277; *abeas* XII 915; *abiat* IV 538; *abeto* IV 2013; *abere* V 4488, X 1365, 4539, XIV 3323; *abebat* IX 2893; *abuit* V 914, 1707, XII 230; *abuis(s)e* IV 3121.

This extreme fluctuation in the matter of the aspirate, which became quite frequent in the second half of the second century A. D. (v. Blass, l. c.; Corssen, op. cit., vol. I, p. 110; Seelmann, Ausspr. d. Lat., p. 265 f.), may very well have arisen early. The *h-* of *h-au h-aud* will, I think, be best explained as a 'vorge-schoben *h*,' which (as in *h-aurio*, v. supra), when once prefixed, was always retained. Nor is it unlikely that the prefixing of this (etymologically incorrect) *h* was partly due to a desire for increased emphasis on a word which, as directly negating the sentence in which it stood, or the word with which it was connected, was one of emphatic importance.<sup>3</sup>

(b) *The d of h-au-d.*

Corssen, Ausspr. Voc. und Beton. d. Lat. Spr.<sup>2</sup>, vol. I (1868), p. 205, regards the *d* of *hau-d* as the remains of the same *-de* which he sees preserved in *quam-de*, *un-de*, *in-de*, *ex-in-de*, *de-in-de*, *pro-in-de*, and which he translates 'even, precisely.' He holds that, whereas in *ex-in*, *de-in*, *pro-in* the *-de* has again disappeared, the ending *e* having first fallen off, and the (thus final) *d* disappearing thereafter, in *haud* the influence of the preceding vowel preserved the *d* after the disappearance of the final *e*. Corssen's explanation of *h-au* has been given above (§3, p. 47, §7, p. 55). The whole word *h-au-d*, therefore, accord-

<sup>1</sup> I quote this word chiefly in order to point out that C. I. L. I 1216 is an incorrect reference for *arrespex*.

<sup>2</sup> *Oratia* for *Horatia* beside Praenestine *Foratia* [Schneider, Dial. Ital. Exx. Select., No. 200 (= Gamurrini, add. 1881, No. 2354)].

<sup>3</sup> It is true that (so far as I have been able to examine the question) 'vorge-schoben *h*' is at least uncommon on inscriptions prior to the Hannibalic war (no instance is found in C. I. L. I 1-195, which consists of 'Inscriptiones vetustissimae Bello Hanniblico quae videntur antiquiores'), but this does not in the least affect my explanation of the *h-* in *h-au h-aud*, for neither does any example of *hau haud* occur prior to the Hannibalic war [cf. supra, §2 (a), p. 43].

ing to Corssen's theory, should strictly mean 'this away precisely': not a very convincing explanation.

Osthoff in Hübschmann, *Das Idg. Vocals.* (1885), p. 191, deriving Gk. *ov* from earlier \**ovδ*, would apparently regard the *d* of *hau-d* as pre-Latin; but his derivation of Gk. *ov*, on which his explanation of the *d* of *hau-d* rests, would appear to be incorrect (see *supra*, §3, p. 48).

Of the ancient grammarians, Marius Victorinus (quoted above, §2, p. 45) remarks: "adiecta (est) *d* littera, quam plerisque verbis (antiqui) adiciebant"; and Charisius (quoted above, §2, p. 46), after a brief discussion of the particle *sed*, continues: "*Haud* similiter *d* littera terminatur; *av* enim . . . *d* littera termina[ri apud antiquos] coepit quibus mos erat *d* litt[eram omnibus] paene vocibus vocali littera finitis adiungere, ut *quo ted hoc noctis* [*dicam pro*] *ficisci foras*." The words of these grammarians can hardly be termed scientific, but I think that their explanation of the *d* of *hau-d* lies nearest to the truth. It seems most probable that the negative particle *hau* became *haud* on analogy of the adversative particle *sed*, aided probably by the extension of the -*d*, the ablative termination of the *o*-stem-nouns and of the pronouns, far beyond its original limits<sup>1</sup> (cf. Brugmann, *Gr.* III, §240, pp. 133 sq., §243, pp. 139 sqq., §442, part 2, §444).

(c) *The t of h-au-t.*

The *t* of *haut* affords no difficulty; we find *d* and *t* very frequently interchanged on inscriptions, e. g.:

*t* for *d*:

*apud* C. I. L. I 206 (15, 34, 120); 818; II 1963 (2, 20)<sup>2</sup>; 1964 (I 13, 17, 19; IV 35); VIII 619, 2634, 4238; IX 259, 339; X 3334 (10); XIV 474 (*quater*), 1597, 1661.

*at* (for *ad*) I 1252; III 633 (I 1, 7, 13, 15); IV 1880, 2013; V 1469, 3408, 8003; VII 1310; VIII 284, 1557; IX 2893, 3314; X 787, 3147, 6565; XII 5961 (5 b); XIV 78, 380, 527.

*athuc* VIII 9624.

*aliut* II 1964 (II 68; IV 6); V 532 (I 23), 1102; VIII 212 (36); X 4787, 4842 (11); XIV 586, 1828 a.

*it* V 875 (6); VIII 2728, 4055; IX 136; X 2780, 7852 (3); XIV 2112 [(I 12) (*a.* 136)], 2795 [(13) (*a.* 140)], 3679 [*a.* 127].

<sup>1</sup> We actually find *advorsus ead* in C. I. L. I 196, 25.

<sup>2</sup> *apud* C. I. L. II 1963 (2, 19).

*quit* IV 1547 a; V 3415; VIII 212 (49), 2532 B, a, 6; IX 3161, 5860; X 761; XII 915; XIV 1874, 3956.

*aliquit* IX 5860, (*haliquit*) XII 915.

*quot* (for *quod*) II 144, 462, 813, 1120; IV 1860; V 2090, 3221; VIII 212 (37), 2728; IX 2164 add., 2475; XII 729, 4326; XIV 1357, 1731, 3014, 3435.

*set* III 847 (al.); IV 1516, 2400; V 5049 (5); VIII 403, 434, 1557, 9519, 10570; IX 1164, 3337; X 2496, 3334 (19), 5429 (12), 7024 (I 6); XII 743, †5750; XIV 166, 480, 914.

*d* for *t*:

*quod* (for *quot*) I 1016; II 1964 (I 2, 10; II 59); IX 2827 (23).

*quodquod annis* V 7450.

*quodannis* V 4410, 4448.

†*ed* VIII 4770; *ed* XII \*427, 1411.

*adque* (for *atque*<sup>1</sup>) VIII 828, 1027, 1179 bis, 2530; IX 1588, 1685, 2974; XII 894, 2228, 3619; XIV 126, 1826, 2046, 2919 bis.

Also not unfrequently we find such interchange in the terminations of the verb, e. g. *asted*, *sied*, *feced* in the old Dvenos inscription,<sup>2</sup> beside *mit(t)at* in the same inscription; cf. also *feced* in C. I. L. I 54, V 1870, VIII 3028, XIV 4112; *diced* IV 1700; *rogad* IV 2388; *liquid* V 7570.

To this great fluctuation between *t* and *d* (aided very possibly by the analogy of the form *aut* 'or') we ought, I think, certainly to ascribe the form *haut* beside *haud*.

§8. *Gk.* οὐ-χι οὐ-χ οὐ-κι οὐ-κ:—(a) *the origin of these extensions together with an examination of* *Skr.* *hī -hī*, *Avest.* *zī zī*, *Lat.* *hic*; (b) *the accent of* *Gk.* οὐ-χι οὐ-κι *beside that of* ἡ-χι *vai-χι.*

(a) *The origin of the extensions* -χι -χ -κι -κ.

(1) οὐ-χι οὐ-κι.

There is, I think, no doubt whatever that οὐ-χι and οὐ-κι must be entirely separated from one another. Roscher indeed, in

<sup>1</sup> The ultimate derivation of Lat. *atque* from earlier Lat. *ad+que* (cf. P. Giles, *Short Manual of Comparative Philology*, §244, p. 180) does not of course affect our point. *adque* in the examples cited is not the old form itself (*ad+que*) preserved, but the new form (*atque*) altered. The form *atque* may be found in C. I. L. 33 ('end of 6th century U. C.,' Ritschl) and thrice in C. I. L. 196 ('supposed to be . . . 568 A. U. C.,' Roby).

<sup>2</sup> Given in Zvetaieff, *Inscr. Ital. Inf. Dial.* (1886), p. 80.



Curtius Stud. III (1870), p. 144, endeavoured to prove "dass in allen vier Wörten (i. e.  $\mu\eta\chi\iota$   $\nu\alpha\iota\chi\iota$   $\sigma\upsilon\chi\iota$   $\eta\chi\iota$ )  $-\chi\iota$  aus ursprünglichem  $-\kappa\iota$  durch Aspiration entstanden ist, dass wir also von der Tenuis ausgehen müssen, wenn wir diese Formen erklären wollen"; but such a suggestion, as Osthoff has clearly shewn in Morph. Unters. IV (1881), pp. 239 ff., "führt lautgesetzlich nicht zum befriedigenden ziele."

$\sigma\upsilon\chi\iota$ .—The  $-\chi\iota$  of  $\sigma\upsilon\chi\iota$ , as also that of  $\nu\alpha\iota\chi\iota$ , is almost certainly to be identified with Skr.  $hi$  'for.' This view, first advanced by Pott (Wurzelwörterb. I 1, 567), and accepted by Osthoff (l. c.), Victor Henry (in Mém. de la Soc. de Ling., vol. VI, part 5, 1889, p. 379) and Per Persson (in Idg. Forsch., vol. II, 1893, p. 247), seems beyond all reasonable doubt to be correct.

The common Idg. ground-form of this Gk.  $-\chi\iota$  Skr.  $hi$ , beside which latter we find also Skr.  $-hi$ ,<sup>1</sup> is  $*gh\tilde{i}$ , as given by Osthoff, l. c., i. e.  $*gh\tilde{i}$ . This is proved to be correct by the Avestic  $z\tilde{i}$ , beside which we find also Avest.  $zi$  'for.'<sup>2</sup> Skr.  $hi$  and Gk.  $-\chi\iota$ , taken by themselves, might quite regularly be derived from either Idg.  $*gh\tilde{i}$  (cf. Brugmann, Gr. I, §§386, 405) or Idg.  $*gh\tilde{i}$  (cf. Brugmann, Gr. I, §§425, 445, 454), but if (as seems undoubtedly right) they are to be identified with Avest.  $z\tilde{i}$ , whose  $z$  can only represent Idg.  $*gh$  (cf. Brugmann, Gr. I, §405, and also §452 on Idg.  $gh$  as represented in Iranian), it follows that  $*gh\tilde{i}$  must be set up as the original Idg. form (cf. also infra, p. 65, note 2, on Old Pers.  $*di$  'for').

The meaning of this Idg.  $*gh\tilde{i}$  (Gk.  $-\chi\iota$  Skr.  $hi$  Avest.  $z\tilde{i}$ ) may be fixed with tolerable certainty by a comparison of the Latin demonstrative pronominal stem  $*ho-$ , in Lat. *hic* (from earlier Lat.  $*ho-i-ce$ , the  $-ce$  of which comes from the Idg. demonstr. pronom. stem  $*ko-$ ), etc., which can come quite regularly from

<sup>1</sup> Beside Skr. *nahī* (from  $nd + hi$ ) we find *nahī* before *nū* in Rigveda 167, 9; 314, 4; 623, 13; also Prātiś. 442, 483 [vid. Grassmann, Wörterb. zum Rign. (1873), s. v. *nahī*]. Is the *i* of this Skr.  $-hi$  to be compared to the *i* of Avestic  $z\tilde{i}$ , or is it due merely to metrical reasons? We find also *nahī nū* in RV. i. 80, 15; vi. 27, 3; *nahī nū* in RV. viii. 21, 7 (v. Osthoff in Morph. Untersuch., vol. IV, p. 240).

<sup>2</sup> The *i* of Avestic  $z\tilde{i}$  is curious; beside it we find once  $z\tilde{i}$  'for,' Yt. xiv. 12 (v. Justi, Handb. d. Zendspr., 125 b), also  $-z\tilde{i}$  in *ya-zī* 'if, whether' from  $*yad-z\tilde{i}$  seen in *yazī-ca* 'and if,' Yt. xxiv. 47 ("lies *yēzica*"?) says Justi, op. cit., s. v. *yazica*), *yē-zī* 'if, whether' for regular *ya-zī* [v. Osthoff in Morph. Unters., vol. IV (1881), p. 240].

Idg. \**gho*-.<sup>1</sup> The relation between Idg. \**gho*- and Idg. \**ghi* would be the same as that between Idg. \**ko*- and Idg. \**ki*- (Brugmann, Gr. III, §409, p. 329), and that between Idg. \**go*- and Idg. \**gi*- (Brugmann, Gr. III, §411, p. 333). Thus Idg. \**gho*- (: Lat. stem *ho*-) \**ghi*- (Gk. -*χι* Skr. *hi* Avest. *zī*) would be a demonstrative pronominal stem, identical in meaning with Idg. \**ko*- \**ki*- 'this.' The development of the meaning 'for' in Skr. and Avest. is easily traced: Idg. \**ghi* would originally mean 'this' (the meaning perhaps still discernible in the -*χι* of Gk. *οὐ-χι*), and might have been used in answers to a question, as we often say 'Just this,' 'Just so,' 'Why, this,' 'Why, just this,' before proceeding with our answer to the question. From the use in such phrases, it might well have developed gradually into a pure conjunction 'for.' It may be observed in this connexion that the Skr. Vedic negative *nahi*, besides its usual meaning 'for not,' shews sometimes the simple meaning 'not' or 'indeed not' (v. Grassmann, Wörterb. zum RV., s. h. v., and Delbrück, Vedische Chrestomathie, p. 84, s. h. v.), in which cases it comes very close to Gk. *οὐ-χι*.

*οὐ-κί*.—The -*κί* of *οὐ-κί*, quite distinct from the -*χι* of *οὐ-χι* (just discussed), is the neuter singular of the demonstrative pronominal stem \**ki*- 'this' (cf. Osthoff, l. c.; Brugmann, Gr. Gr.<sup>2</sup>, §95, p. 131, and Gr. III, §182, p. 49, E. E., §331, p. 330, E. E.), so that *οὐ-κί* meant originally 'not this,' and is thus identical in meaning with *οὐ-χι* 'not this' (v. supra).

(2) *οὐχ*, *οὐκ*.

None of the theories yet advanced in explanation of Gk. *οὐχ*, *οὐκ* seems at all satisfactory.

We may at once dispose of Pott's above-mentioned (§3, p. 47) identification of Gk. *οὐκ* with Skr. *āvāk*. Skr. *āvāk* is of course, strictly, the nom. acc. sing. neut. of Skr. *āvāc* 'turned downwards,' which is compounded of Skr. *āva* 'off, down' and -*ac*- 'bent in a certain direction, turned' (from Idg. \**uq*-, seen in Gk. *ποδ-αν-ός*, Lat. *prop-inqu-o-s*); cf. Whitney, Skr. Gr., §§407, 409; Brugmann, Gr. I, §228, p. 195.

Osthoff, l. c., explains *οὐκ* : *οὐχ* in the following way:—he holds that in cases of apostrophe of the -*ι* before a following aspirated

<sup>1</sup> Brugmann, Gr. III, §409, Rem. 1, pp. 330, 331, was doubtful how to derive the Latin stem *ho*-.

vowel, οὐκί and οὐχί fell together in οὐχ'; so that e. g. οὐχ ὄτι, οὐχ ἄπτομαι can belong to both οὐκί and οὐχί; before ἔτι he thinks there probably existed both οὐ-κ- and οὐ-χ- (οὐ-κ-έτι and \*οὐ-χ-έτι), comparing the Etym. Magn. 368, 30 ὁφείλε γὰρ λέγεσθαι οὐχ' ἔρχομαι. Then at a later date, according to his theory, \*οὐχ-έτι and \*οὐχ' ἔρχομαι gave way, the use of οὐχ, beside οὐκ from οὐκί, becoming confined to the position before spiritus asper on the analogy of other cases, such as ἀφ' beside ἀπ', καθ' beside κατ', ἀνθ' beside ἀντ', so that thenceforth οὐχ appeared only as a phonetic (or graphic) modification of οὐκ.

Victor Henry, in *Mém. de la Soc. de Ling.*, vol. VI, part 5, 1889, pp. 379 sq., without taking οὐκί into consideration at all, regards οὐχ and οὐκ as both derivable primarily from οὐχί. His explanation is that "before an initial vowel the *i* is elided, e. g. οὐχ ἔξω, and if the following consonant was an aspirate, then the *χ* had to lose its aspiration, whence οὐκ ἔχω, οὐκ ἦλθον; whereupon," according to his theory, "the relation of οὐκ ἔχω to οὐχ ἔξω, and others similar, gave rise to the belief that the *χ* of this last combination was due to the rough breathing of ἔξω, so that the 'deaspiration' has gained more and more, whence οὐκ ἔστι, οὐκ ὄλωλε."

But surely there is at hand a much simpler explanation than either of these two latter. If, as is most probable, οὐ-χί and οὐ-κί both had originally the same meaning 'not this' (v. supra, pp. 62, 63), then both would be used indiscriminately. This being so, it was but natural that in cases of the elision of the *i* before a following aspirated word the form οὐχ(*i*) would be chosen, while on the other hand before a following non-aspirated word the form used would be οὐκ(*i*).

(b) *The accent of οὐ-χί οὐ-κί beside that of ἦ-χι ναί-χι.*

Assuming the correctness of the view that "-χί = Skr. *hi* = Idg. accented \**ǵhí*," it appears that the words were originally accented thus: \*οὐ χί, \*ἦ χί, \*ναί χί, and then when composition of the two members took place, the already existing accent on ἦ and ναί ousted the competing accent on \*χί, while in οὐχί the accent of \*χί had no rival, and consequently remained.

In the same way οὐκί was originally accented \*οὐ κί, and then when the two words became one, the accent remained on the -κί in οὐκί for the same reason that it remained on the -χί in οὐχί.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Osthoff, in *Morph. Untersuch.*, vol. IV (1881), p. 244, thinks it possible that the prim. Gk. form of Gk. οὐκί was \*οὐ-κί (cf. πολλά-κι), and that then \*οὐ-κί later became οὐκί on analogy of οὐχί.

§9. *Armenian zi.*

Arm. *zi*<sup>1</sup> 'for' ought, I think, certainly to be identified with Skr. *hi* and (more rarely) *-hi*, Avest. *zi* and (more rarely) *zi*, Old Pers. *\*di*<sup>2</sup> 'for,' from Idg. *\*ǵhi* (*\*ǵhī*).

Hübschmann (Arm. Stud. I, p. 79) and Brugmann (Gr. I, §410) hold that Idg. *ǵh*, initially and after *n*, *r*, was represented in Armenian by *j*, and only after vowels by *z*; e. g. *jaune-m* 'I

---

But why should Gk. *-κί* (from Idg. *\*kī-*) be regarded as originally accentless? It is true that we cannot adduce any evidence from Sanskrit to settle the question either way, as there seems to be no Skr. representative of Idg. *\*kī-* (Brugmann, at any rate, gives none in the Grundr. III, §409, pp. 329, 330, E. E.). Nor do the representatives of Idg. *\*kī-* in other Idg. languages—e. g. Lith. *ši-s* O.C.Sl. *si* O.Ir. *ce* 'this (masc.),' Goth. *hit(-a)* Ags. *hit* O.Norse *hit(t)* 'this (neut.)'—prove anything for the accent. Nevertheless, my explanation of the accent of *οἰκί*, given above in the text, seems to me preferable to that of Osthoff.

In *πολλά-κί* (which seems manifestly later than *οἰκί*) we see the same process as we saw above in *ἦ-χί ναί-χί*, where *ἦ ναί* having already an accent of their own, ousted the competing accent already existing on *-χί*. Thus *πολλά* and *\*κί*, when combined, produced *\*πολλακί*, whence *πολλάκι* (whence many an analogical formation, e. g. *πλειστάκι*, *ὀλιγάκι*, *ὄσσάκι*, *τοσσάκι*, etc.).

In *οἰ-κί*, on the other hand, there was no competing accent on the *οἰ* to oust that on *-κί*, whence the combination produced *οἰκί*.

<sup>1</sup> Hübschmann, Arm. Stud. I, p. 12, and note 1; also Justi, Handb. d. Zendspr. (1864), s. v. *zi*.

<sup>2</sup> I have written an asterisk against Old Pers. *\*di* 'for,' because Old Pers. does not actually shew a word *\*di* with the meaning 'for.' We find, indeed, in Old Persian a pronominal stem *di-* = 'this (masc.),' of which the accus. sing. *dīm* and the accus. plur. *dīš* appear [v. Spiegel, Die Altpers. Keilinschriften (1881), p. 225]. These Persian forms are enclitic (v. Justi, op. cit., s. v. *dī*). With this Old Persian stem *di-* Justi (l. c.) and Jackson (Avesta Reader, 1893, p. 73) identify Avestic *di-*, which also is an enclitic pronoun, third person (v. Jackson, l. c.). Now it is obvious that this Avestic *di-* cannot be identified with Avestic *zi zi*, Skr. *hi -hi*, Gk. *χί*, from Idg. *\*ǵhi*, hence from these we must separate also Old Pers. *di-* (if this latter is identical with Avest. *di-*). But the Old Pers. form *\*di* 'for' may quite regularly be referred to *\*ǵhi* [v. Hübschmann, Arm. Stud. (1883), I, p. 12, note 1; Brugmann, Grundr. I, §405], hence it is possible that Old Pers. *\*di* 'for' from Idg. *\*ǵhi* fell together with the (etymologically) quite different stem which was represented in Avest. and Old Pers. by *di-* 'this,' and hence lost its own, apparently Prim. Aryan (Skr. and Avest.), meaning 'for.' Indeed, if I am right in assigning the meaning 'this' to Idg. *\*ǵhi* (v. supra, §8, p. 63), it is possible that Old Pers. *\*di*, in contrast to Skr. *hi -hi* and Avest. *zi zi*, never reached the development of meaning 'for,' and hence all the more easily fell together with the synonymous (but etymologically different) form, Old Pers. *di-* 'this.'

dedicate, sacrifice' from  $\sqrt{g}hey-$  'pour,' *lizum* 'I lick' (: Skr. *lēh-mī*). If this rule is correct, we can only derive Arm. *zi* from Idg.  $*\tilde{g}hi$  by supposing that  $*\tilde{g}hi$  was already in Idg. so closely attached to any preceding word which ended in a vowel that the compound thus formed came to be regarded as a word-unity,<sup>1</sup> and that later in some of the individual developments of Idg. the compound split up again, e. g. Arm. *zi* Avest. *zī* Skr. *hī*, contrasted with Avest. *yē-zī* *yē-zī* 'if' Skr. *nahī nahī* Gk. *ὀνχί*, where the compound form has remained. Perhaps, however, the rule, as stated by Hübschmann and Brugmann (v. supra), is too narrow.<sup>2</sup>

Besides Arm. *zi* 'for' we find also in Armenian *zi* =  $\tau_i$ , *zi*? =  $\tau_i$ ; Hübschmann, Arm. Stud. I, p. 12, says that if we identify Arm. *zi* 'for' with Skr. *hi* Avest. *zī* 'for' we must separate it from *zi* =  $\tau_i$ , *zi*? =  $\tau_i$ ; I cannot see from what other original than  $*\tilde{g}hi$  we can derive these latter; the original meaning of Idg.  $*\tilde{g}hi$  appears to be 'this' (v. supra, §8, p. 63), from which the transition to the meaning  $\tau_i$  is easy enough, although the transition to the meaning  $\tau_i$ ; is, I admit, not quite so clear. But, after all, it is much the same difficulty as we have in the transition

<sup>1</sup> In view of the fact that Skr. *hī* -*hī* Avestic *zī* *zī* Greek -*χί* are always (so to speak) 'postposition-particles,' this would not be a very rash assumption.

<sup>2</sup> Arm. *zard* 'adornment' I would derive from Idg.  $*\tilde{g}hr-tu-$ , and identify (save for the suffix, on which see Brugmann, Gr. II, §108, p. 327) with Gk.  $\chi\alpha\rho-\tau\acute{o}-\varsigma$  'delightful, in which one takes pleasure,'  $\sqrt{g}her$ , which is seen also in Skr. *hṛ-ya-ti* 'takes pleasure in' Gk.  $\chi\alpha\rho\omega$ , Umbr. *heris* 'vis' *heriest* (fut.) 'volet,' Osc. *heriiad* 'velit.' Thus the relation between Arm. *zar-d* from  $*\tilde{g}hr-tu-$  and Gk.  $\chi\alpha\rho-\tau\acute{o}-\varsigma$  from  $*\tilde{g}hr-t\acute{o}-s$  is exactly the same as that between Skr.  $\gamma-t\acute{u}-\tilde{s}$  and Skr.  $\gamma-t\acute{d}-s$ . Thus Arm. *zard* means primarily 'something in which one takes a delight, has pleasure.' So too Skr. *hiraṇya* (for  $*haranya$ ?), Avest. *zaranya* 'gold' (Pr. Iran.  $*\tilde{z}h\tilde{r}anya$ ) are also traceable to this  $\sqrt{g}her-$  (cf. Whitney, Skr. Roots, p. 203, s. v. *har*), and originally meant 'something in which one takes pleasure.'

If the derivation of Arm. *zi* from Idg.  $*\tilde{g}hi$ , and of Arm. *zard* from Idg.  $*\tilde{g}hr-tu-$  is correct, then the rule concerning the Armenian representation of initial Idg.  $\tilde{g}h$  as stated by Hübschmann and Brugmann is too narrow.

What, again, is the explanation of the so-called 'prefix' *z* which so often occurs in Armenian, e. g. *z-erc-ani-m* 'I free myself' (Hübschmann, Arm. Stud. I, p. 31), *z-ge-nu-m* 'I dress myself' *z-gest* 'dress'  $\sqrt{ves-}$  'dress' (Hübschmann, op. cit., p. 30), *z-air-ana-l* 'to be in a passion' beside *air-el* 'to burn' (Hübschmann, op. cit., p. 12)? Cf. also the accusatives *z-is* 'me' *z-k'es* 'thee' *z-mez* 'us' *z-jez* 'you' (Hübschmann, op. cit., p. 70); vide on the subject Hübschmann, Arm. Stud., p. 12, where he refers to his Kasuslehre, p. 317.

of meaning between Gk. *τι* (indef.) : Gk. *τί;* (interrog.), both of which come from the same original Idg. form.

§10. *The ȓ of Armenian oċ 'not.'*

Before concluding the present investigation, it will be well to add a short remark on the ȓ of Arm. *oċ* 'not,' which I would analyse *o-ȓ*.<sup>1</sup>

I will not venture to explain the difficult vocalism of *o-ȓ* (of which, by the way, I can find no mention in Brugmann's *Grundriss*). Arm. *oċ* has long been compared with Gk. *ὀν*, and de Lagarde, *Arm. Stud.*, p. 181, regarded their identification as "richtig oder doch in hohem grade wahrscheinlich." Hübschmann, however, is undoubtedly right in holding (*Arm. Stud.* I, p. 13) that "*oċ* 'nicht' = gr. *ὀν* zu setzen, ist aus lautlichen Gründen im höchsten Masse bedenklich." If (as I believe to be the correct view) Gk. *ὀν* represents Idg. *\*ou*,<sup>2</sup> the *o*- of *o-ȓ* certainly cannot be identified with Gk. *ὀν*, seeing that *o* is never the Armenian representative of Idg. *\*ou* (for the true representation of which in Armenian, see Hübschmann in *Zeitschr. d. Deutsch. Morgenl. Ges.* XXXV, 1881, p. 172, and *Arm. Stud.* I, 1883, p. 62; Brugmann, *Grundr.* I, 1886, §63; Bartholomae in *Bezz. Beitr.* XVII, 1891, p. 99). Nor can Bugge's attempt to derive *oċ* from Arm. *\*ōȓ* from Arm. *\*auȓ* from Idg. *\*au-* (Kuhn's *Zeitschr.* XXXII, 1893, p. 30) be accepted; this will be manifest from the following communication, which I have received from Prof. Hübschmann himself, concerning (1) the examples which Bugge cites in support of his etymology, (2) the Armenian representation of Idg. *ay-*: "Arm. *sosk* heisst 'blos, allein, leer' und hat mit skr. *śūṣka-*, etc., nichts zu thun. Ob arm. *boċ*

<sup>1</sup> The first member of Arm. *o-ȓ*, namely *o-*, is never (like Gk. *οἱ*) used independently. But it is interesting to note that the second member, namely *ȓ*, is used independently, instead of the full form *oċ*, frequently with verbs and sometimes with substantives, e. g. Arm. *ȓ-astvac* 'not god,' i. e. 'idol.' Cf. also the Old Armenian proper-name *ȓ-unak*, Catholicos, successor of Nerses, 'not-having,' i. e. 'poor' (v. Hübschmann, 'Die altarm. Personennamen,' in *Festgruss an Rudolf von Roth*, 1893). Curiously enough, the same phenomenon is visible in Modern Greek where Old Greek *οὐδέν* appears as *όέν*, the truly negative part of the word having been dropped off, without the meaning being thereby affected. Examples of the same phenomenon occurring in other languages will be found in Ziemer, *Vergl. Synt. der Idg. Comparison* (1884), p. 186, and note 1.

<sup>2</sup> Vid. *supra*, §4, p. 51.

'Flamme' zu *πιφαύσκω* gehört ist gleichfalls nicht sicher und beweist jedenfalls für arm. *o* = ursp. *au* nichts. Es giebt *bisher* kein sicheres Beispiel für die Gleichung arm. *o* = ursp. *au*."

In discussing the *ç* of *o-ç* we are on firmer ground. In Armenian, which does not labialise the velars, Idg. *q* (except after a nasal or liquid) becomes regularly *k*, *k'*, but *ç* from *k* before original *e*- and *i*-vowels (see Hübschmann in Zeitschr. d. Deutsch. Morgenl. Ges. XXXV 172 f., and Armen. Stud. I, pp. 66, 67; Brugmann, Gr. I, §455). Thus we may derive the *ç* of Arm. *o-ç* from Idg. *\*qi* (: Gk. *τι*, cf. *οῦ-τι*) or Idg. *\*qe* (: Gk. *τε*, cf. *οῦ-τε*). Bugge, in Kuhn's Zeitschr. XXXII, p. 31, comparing Arm. *açk'* beside Gk. *ἄσσε* from *\*ὀκίε*, thinks that the *ç* of Arm. *oç* can correspond to the *-κι* of Greek *οὐ-κί*; but he is, I think, at fault herein; for, whereas Arm. *ç* cannot be the outcome of an Idg. *k* (v. Brugmann, Gr. I, §§380, 408), the *-κι* which occurs in *οὐ-κί*, *πολλά-κι*, etc., and in the Greek numerical adverbs such as *τετράκι*, *πεντάκι*, etc., comes from the Idg. demonstrative stem *\*k̑i-* (v. supra, §8, p. 63) and not from the Idg. interrogative and indefinite pronominal stem *\*qi-*.<sup>1</sup> Hence we must separate the *ç* of Arm. *o-ç* from Gk. *-κι*, and identify it with Gk. *τι* (from Idg. *\*qi*) or *τε* (from Idg. *\*qe*).

§11. *Classification of the forms discussed in the foregoing §§8-10.*

The forms which we have been discussing in §§8-10 (incl.) may be classed accordingly:—

I.

Idg. *\*k̑o-* *\*k̑i-*:

Lat. *-ce* in *\*ho-i-ce* (whence *hic*) from the Idg. demonstrative pronominal stem *\*k̑o-* 'this.'

Gk. *-κί* in *οὐ-κί*, nom. acc. sing. neut. of the Idg. demonstrative pronominal stem *\*k̑i-* 'this';<sup>2</sup> cf. Goth. *hit(-a)*, Ags. *hit*, O.Norse *hit(t)* 'this (neut.)', and Lith. *szì-s* O.C.Sl. *sz* O.Ir. *ce* 'this (masc.).'<sup>3</sup>

Gk. *-κ* in *οὐ-κ*, abridged from *-κί* in *οὐ-κί*.<sup>4</sup>

<sup>1</sup> If Greek *-κί* were from Idg. *\*qi-*, as is assumed by Wackernagel (in Kuhn's Zeitschr. XXV, p. 286 f.) and J. Schmidt (Pluralb., p. 352), all the Greek dialects except Thessalian must have had *-τι* in place of it (v. Brugmann, Gr. III, §182, p. 49 and note 1, §409, p. 330, Engl. edit.).

<sup>2</sup> Supra, §8 (a) (1), s. v. *οὐ-κί*, p. 63, and (b) text and note, p. 64.

<sup>3</sup> Supra, §8 (b), note, p. 64.

<sup>4</sup> Supra, §8 (a) (2) ad fin., p. 64.